

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 1-32 have been amended to improve their form and clarity. In this respect, the claims now clarify delivering of the document, as opposed to delivering of document information. Independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32 have been further amended to define that the delivery destination of a document is determined based on the delivery settings and the external device which is the transmission source of the document. Moreover, independent claims 11, 21, and 31 have been further amended to include the delivery setting step or instruction corresponding to the delivery setting means set forth in independent claims 1 and 32. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23, and 26-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge (USP 6,397,261). Claims 4, 14, and 24 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge in view of Wells (USP 5,999,601). Remaining claims 5, 15, and 25 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge in view of Adamske (USP 6,615,234). Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32 clearly distinguish over the applied references because these references would have disclosed or taught the claimed document delivery features.

Specifically, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32 call for, when a document is received from an external source, determining the delivery destination of the document based on the delivery settings and the external device, which is the transmission source of the document, and for delivering the document to the determined delivery destination, which includes at least one of a server or an external device that processes the delivered document.

Eldridge discloses a system for authenticating mobile computing devices via tokens. Eldridge's system includes a token-enable document server that uses digital signatures to provide secure transfer of document tokens between the mobile computing devices and a wire based network. Eldridge's system retrieves and formats a document that is referenced by a document token and delivers the retrieved/formatted document to a driver or interface, namely a filing interface 146, a fax driver 148, a printer driver 150, an email interface 152, or a viewing

driver 156, for accessing one of the document processing devices such as a printer 102 or a workstation 108. See column 5, 4th full paragraph reproduced below:

After retrieving and formatting a document referenced by a document token, the token-aware document delivery server 138 delivers the formatted document to a driver or interface for accessing one of the document processing devices located on Intranet 116 (e.g., printer 102 or personal workstation 108). The drivers or interfaces available on the token-aware document delivery server 138 include a filing interface 146, a fax driver 148, a print driver 150, an email interface 152, or a viewing driver 156. In an alternate embodiment (not shown), the token-enabled server 126 includes a document capture server, which stores and allows access to documents received from input devices such as scanner 110 and fax server 106.

In Eldridge, the delivery destination is determined based on the token and not based on delivery settings and the external device, namely the transmission source of the document. Note that a token is not a transmission source of a document since it does not transmit or carry any document. Eldridge's delivery destination determination is thus made entirely different from that set forth in independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32. As Wells and Adamske do not alleviate Eldridge's shortcomings, applicant submits that the applied references would not have disclosed or taught the invention set forth in independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-32 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

19 FEBRUARY 2007

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)